



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/964,843	09/28/2001	Gopinath Meghashyam	P 281352 P12146	3728
27496	7590	01/11/2005	EXAMINER	
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP			SCUDERI, PHILIP S	
725 S. FIGUEROA STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 2800				
LOS ANGELES, CA 90017			2153	

DATE MAILED: 01/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/964,843	MEGHASHYAM ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Philip S. Scuderi	2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 September 2001.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 1, 4, 7, 11, 15, and 17 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 28 September 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 4, 7, 11, 15, and 17 are objected to because of minor informalities.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 1 recites the phrase “upon on the link being activated”. The examiner suggests the limitation “upon the link being activated”.

Claim 4 recites the phrase “receiving a request from a user through a bowser”. The examiner suggests the limitation “receiving a request from a user through a browser”.

Claim 7 recites the phrase “gathering users language preference”. The examiner suggests the phrase “gathering the user’s language preference”.

Claim 11 recites the phrase “the user’s preferences include user’s language preference”. The examiner suggests the phrase “the user’s preferences include the user’s language preference”.

Claim 15 recites the phrase “a regiistration mechanism”. The examiner suggests the phrase “a registration mechanism”.

Claim 17 recites the phrase “the user is considered authenticate”. The examiner suggests the phrase “the user is considered authenticated”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 11 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 11, which is dependent upon claim 10, recites the limitation "wherein the user's preferences include user's language preference" in lines 1-2. However, according to claim 10, the information related to the user does not necessarily include user's preferences. Therefore claim 11 is indefinite. This indefinite limitation also raises the question of whether claim 11 further limits claim 10.

Claim 29 recites the limitation "the information stored in a user's information database" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The examiner suggests "information stored in a user's information database".

Claim 29 recites the limitation "the information related to the user stored in the user information database" in lines 8-9 and 11-12. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The examiner suggests "information related to the user stored in the user information database".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 4, 16, 17, 22, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bari et al. (U.S. Pub. 2002/0023059, hereinafter “Bari”).

With respect to claims 1 and 22, Bari discloses a method comprising the following steps and a computer readable medium encoded with a program (the system of figure 5 must comprise a web server having a computer readable medium encoded with a program in order to serve the web page), the program when executed, causing the following:

- registering a user from a browser, at a main web site (fig. 5, ¶ 36 lines 5-10);
- generating, at the main web site, a linking page, containing a link to an affiliated web site (¶ 43 lines 5-8);
- advising the user about an available service offered at the affiliated web site, which can be reached through the link (¶ 43 lines 5-8);
- choosing, by the user, to connect to the affiliated web site for the available service through activating the link on the linking page (¶ 43 lines 7-12, ¶ 44 lines 32-36, fig. 9D);
- issuing, by the main web site, upon the link being activated, a ticket, to the user, encoded with different kinds of information related to the user (fig. 9B #920, ¶ 44 lines 23-26);
- requesting, by the user, the available service at the affiliated web site using the ticket (¶ 43 lines 7-12);
- verifying, at the affiliated web site; the ticket transferred from the main web site (inherent in ¶ 44 lines 15-19); and

- providing the available service to the user if the verifying the ticket is successful

(¶ 44 lines 23-36, ¶ 44 lines 32-36).

With respect to claims 4 and 25, Bari discloses a method for a main web site, comprising the following steps and a computer readable medium encoded with a program for a main web site (the system of figure 5 must comprise a web server having a computer readable medium encoded with a program in order to serve the web page), the program, when executed, causing the following:

- receiving a request from a user through a browser (the user inherently requested the web page shown in fig. 5);
- authenticating the user based on information stored at the main web site (¶ 36 lines 19-23);
- generating, at the main web site, a linking page, containing a link to an affiliated web site (¶ 43 lines 5-8);
- advising, through the linking page, the user about an available service offered at the affiliated web site, which can be reached through the link (¶ 43 lines 5-8);
- receiving, from the user, a choice to connect to the affiliated web site for the available service (¶ 43 lines 7-8);
- issuing, upon receiving the choice of connecting to the available service, a ticket encoded with different kinds of information related to the user (fig. 9B #920) and to be used by the user to request the available service at the affiliated web site (¶ 44 lines 23-28); and
- transferring the ticket from the main web site to the user (fig. 9B #920).

With respect to claim 16, Bari discloses a system for a main web site, comprising:

- a user registration mechanism for registering a user, requesting to connect to the main web site, via a browser (fig. 5, ¶ 36 lines 5-10);
- a linking page generation mechanism for generating a linking page that contains a link to an affiliated web site and that is to be used to advise the user about an available service offered at the affiliated web site (¶ 43 lines 5-8), which can be reached through the link (¶ 43 lines 8-12, ¶ 44 lines 32-36);
- an online service mechanism for providing online services to the user (fig. 5); and
- a service transfer mechanism for issuing the ticket to the user when the user chooses, through the linking page, to connect to the affiliated web site for the available service, the ticket enabling the user to connect to the affiliated web site without the need to enter the information related to the user (¶ 43 lines 5-12).

With respect to claim 17, Bari discloses the system applied to claim 16. Bari further discloses the system, wherein the registration mechanism comprises:

- a user information database for storing the information related to users of the main web site (inherent in ¶ 36 lines 1-4);
- an authentication mechanism for authenticating the user based on the information stored in the user information database and the information entered by the user with the requesting (¶ 36 lines 10-16); and
- a registration mechanism for registering the user at the main web site, provided that the user is considered authenticated by the authenticating (¶ 36 lines 5-10), and for updating the information related to the user in the user information database according to the information provided with the requesting (¶ 38 lines 1-5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 23, 24, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bari in view of Krajewski, Jr. et al. (U.S. 5,590,199, hereinafter “Krajewski”), and further in view of Rosen (U.S. 5,621,797, hereinafter “Rosen”).

With respect to claims 2 and 23, Bari discloses the method applied to claim 1 and the computer-readable medium encoded with a program applied to claim 22. Bari further discloses issuing the ticket comprising gathering information related to the user (¶ 44 lines 13-15). Bari does not disclose issuing the ticket comprising issuing a timestamp. Nonetheless, issuing a ticket for a service comprising issuing a timestamp is well known, as evidenced by Krajewski. In a similar art, Krajewski discloses issuing a ticket for a service comprising a timestamp (col. 2 lines 53-55). Given the teachings of Krajewski it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to issue the ticket comprising issuing a timestamp. The motivation for doing so would have been so that the ticket will expire – forcing the user to present his/her credentials again. Thus, if the ticket is intercepted in transit the perpetrator could only gain access to the service for a limited amount of time. The instant invention does not disclose the issuing the ticket comprising

generating a digital signature of the ticket. Nonetheless, issuing a ticket comprising generating a digital signature of a ticket is well known, as evidenced by Rosen. In a similar art, Rosen discloses issuing a ticket comprising generating a digital signature of the ticket (fig. 2 #14, col. 7 lines 36-38). Given the teachings of Rosen it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to issue the ticket comprising a digital signature of the ticket. The motivation for doing so would have been to verify the ticket's source. It is inherent in the instant invention that the ticket is created (encoded), based upon the information related to the user, the timestamp, and the digital signature.

With respect to claims 3 and 24, Bari in view of Krajewski, and further in view of Rosen teaches the method applied to claim 2 and the computer-readable medium encoded with a program applied to claim 23. It would have been necessary to decode the ticket and authenticate the digital signature of the ticket in order to verify the ticket's source as discussed in the rejection of claims 2 and 23.

With respect to claims 5 and 26, Bari discloses the method for a main web site applied to claim 4 and the computer-readable medium encoded with a program for a main web site applied to claim 25. Bari further discloses issuing the ticket comprising determining the user's identification (necessary in order to search the user profile as discussed in ¶ 44 lines 13-15) and gathering information related to the user (¶ 44 lines 13-15). Bari does not disclose issuing the ticket comprising issuing a timestamp. Nonetheless, issuing a ticket for a service comprising issuing a timestamp is well known, as evidenced by Krajewski. In a similar art, Krajewski discloses issuing a ticket for a service comprising issuing a timestamp (col. 2 lines 53-55). Given the teachings of Krajewski it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to issue the ticket

comprising issuing a timestamp. The motivation for doing so would have been so that the ticket will expire – forcing the user to present his/her credentials again. Thus, if the ticket is intercepted in transit the perpetrator could only gain access to the service for a limited amount of time. The instant invention does not disclose issuing the ticket comprising generating a digital signature of the ticket. Nonetheless, issuing a ticket comprising generating a digital signature of the ticket is well known, as evidenced by Rosen. In a similar art, Rosen discloses issuing a ticket comprising generating a digital signature of the ticket (fig. 2 #14, col. 7 lines 36-38). Given the teachings of Rosen it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to issue the ticket comprising a digital signature of the ticket. The motivation for doing so would have been to verify the ticket's source. It is inherent in the instant invention that the ticket is created (encoded), based upon the information related to the user, the timestamp, and the digital signature.

With respect to claim 6, Bari in view of Krajewski, and further in view of Rosen teaches the method for a main web site applied to claim 5. Bari further discloses the method wherein the gathering the information related to the user includes obtaining the user's information from the user (¶ 44 lines 15-19).

With respect to claims 8 and 27, Bari in view of Krajewski, and further in view of Rosen teaches the method for a main web site applied to claim 5 and the computer-readable medium encoded with a program for a main web site applied to claim 26. The examiner takes Official Notice that “encoding information in a cookie so that an affiliated web site in the same domain could access the information” was very well known in the art at the time of invention. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to encode the ticket in a cookie, if the affiliated web site is in the same domain

as the web site. The motivation for doing so would have been so that the affiliated web site could access the ticket.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bari in view of Krajewski, further in view of Rosen, and further in view of *Debian GNU/Linux -- Setting the Default Language*, (“<http://web.archive.org/web/20000706225914/http://www.debian.org/intro/cn>”, 7/6/2000, hereinafter “Debian”).

With respect to claim 7, Bari in view of Krajewski, and further in view of Rosen teaches the method for a main web site applied to claim 6. Bari discloses that the information related to the user comprises various data points such as name, email, age, gender, etc. Bari does not expressly disclose that the information related to the user comprises the user’s language preference. Nonetheless, storing a user’s information comprising the user’s language preference is well known, as evidenced by Debian. In a similar art, Debian discloses storing a user’s language preference (p. 1 “To set the default language in your browser you have to set a variable that gets passed to the web server.”). Given the teachings of Debian it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adapt the gathering the user’s information to include gathering the user’s language preference. The motivation for doing so would have been so that in the case that the affiliated site requires a default language setting the method is able to provide the default language setting.

Claims 9, 10, 13-15, 18-21, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bari in view of Rosen.

With respect to claim 9 and 28, Bari discloses a method for an affiliated web site, comprising the following steps and a computer readable medium encoded with a program for an affiliated web site (the system of figure 9D inherently comprises a web server having a computer readable medium encoded with a program), the program, when executed, causing the following:

- receiving a request from a user with a ticket comprising information related to the user (inherent in ¶ 44 lines 23-26);
- decoding the ticket to extract information related to the user (inherent in ¶ 44 lines 23-26, the ticket must be decoded to extract the information);
- registering the user based on the information related to the user (¶ 44 lines 23-26); and
- providing an available service offered at the affiliated web site to the user (¶ 44 lines 32-36).

Bari does not expressly disclose the ticket comprising a digital signature. Nonetheless, a ticket comprising a digital signature is well known, as evidenced by Rosen. In a similar art, Rosen discloses a ticket comprising a digital signature (fig. 2 #14, col. 7 lines 36-38). Given the teachings of Rosen it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to issue the ticket comprising a digital signature. The motivation for doing so would have been to verify the ticket's source. Given the above modification it would have been necessary to authenticate the digital signature of the ticket in order to verify the ticket's source as discussed above.

With respect to claim 10, Bari in view of Rosen teaches the method for an affiliated web site applied to claim 9. Bari further discloses that the information related to the user includes the user's preferences (fig. 9B #920 shows how the user prefers to be identified).

With respect to claim 13, Bari discloses a system, comprising:

- a main web site for offering online services (fig. 5);
- a web client comprising a browser (fig. 5) and a user communicating with the main web site through the browser (¶ 36 lines 1-4);
- an affiliated web site with the main web site for offering a service that can be advised to the user through the main web site (¶ 43 lines 5-8) and that can be provided to the user when the main web site transfers the user to the affiliated web site (¶ 43 lines 8-12, ¶ 42 lines 32-36) with a ticket containing information related to the user (fig. 9B #920, ¶ 44 lines 23-26).

Bari does not disclose the ticket containing a digital signature. Nonetheless, issuing a ticket comprising a digital signature is well known, as evidenced by Rosen. In a similar art, Rosen discloses issuing a ticket comprising a digital signature (fig. 2 #14, col. 7 lines 36-38). Given the teachings of Rosen it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adapt the ticket to comprise a digital signature. The motivation for doing so would have been to verify the ticket's source.

With respect to claim 14, Bari in view of Rosen teaches the system applied to claim 13. Bari further discloses the system, wherein the main web site comprises:

- a user registration mechanism for registering the user at the main web site when the user connects to the main web site via the browser (fig. 5, ¶ 36 lines 5-10);

- a linking page generation mechanism for generating a linking page that contains a link to the affiliated web site and that is to be used to advise the user about an available service offered at the affiliated web site, which can be reached through the link (inherent in ¶ 43 lines 5-8);
- an online service mechanism for providing the online services to the user (fig. 5); and
- a service transfer mechanism for issuing the ticket to the user (fig. 9B #920) when the user chooses, through the linking page, to connect to the affiliated web site for the available service, the ticket enabling the user to connect to the affiliated web site without the need to enter the information related to the user (¶ 43 lines 8-12).

With respect to claim 15, Bari in view of Rosen teaches the system applied to claim 14. Bari further discloses the following:

- a registration mechanism for registering the user, at the affiliated web site (inherent in ¶ 44 lines 23-26); and
- an online service mechanism for providing the user the available service (fig. 9D, ¶ 44 lines 32-36).

In order to verify the ticket's source, as discussed in the rejection of claim 13, it would have been necessary to modify the affiliated web site to comprise a ticket authentication mechanism for authenticating the ticket received from the user to request the available service. Given the above modification it would have been obvious to register the user after the authenticating the ticket was completed. The motivation for doing so would have been so that an unverified source is not able to register the user.

With respect to claim 18, Bari discloses the system applied to claim 17. Bari further discloses the system wherein the service transfer mechanism comprises a ticket issuing mechanism for issuing the ticket based on the information related to the user (fig. 9B #920). Bari does not disclose a ticket signing mechanism for generating a digital signature based on a signing key for the ticket or a ticket encoding mechanism for encoding the ticket with the digital signature. Nonetheless, a digital signature based on a signing key for a ticket and a ticket encoding mechanism for encoding the ticket with the digital signature are well known, as evidenced by Rosen. In a similar art, Rosen discloses a ticket signing mechanism for generating a digital signature for a ticket based on a signing key for the ticket (col. 7 lines 38-39) and a ticket encoding mechanism for encoding the ticket with the digital signature (inherent in col. 7 lines 36-38). Given the teachings of Rosen it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adapt the service transfer mechanism to comprise a ticket signaling mechanism for generating a digital signature based on a signing key for the ticket and a ticket encoding mechanism for encoding the ticket with the digital signature. The motivation for doing so would have been so that the affiliated web site could verify the identity of the sender.

With respect to claim 19, Bari discloses a system for an affiliated web site, comprising:

- a ticket authentication mechanism for authenticating a ticket received from a user to request an available service at the affiliated web site (¶ 44 lines 13-15, the system authenticates a ticket by determining if any additional information is required);

- a registration mechanism for registering the user, after the authenticating the ticket, at the affiliated web site based on the information related to the user included in the ticket (¶ 44 lines 23-26); and
- an online service mechanism for providing the available service to the user (inherent in ¶ 44 lines 32-36).

Bari does not disclose the ticket comprising a digital signature. Nonetheless, a ticket comprising a digital signature of a ticket is well known, as evidenced by Rosen. In a similar art, Rosen discloses a ticket comprising a digital signature (fig. 2 #14, col. 7 lines 36-38). Given the teachings of Rosen it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adapt the ticket to comprise a digital signature. The motivation for doing so would have been to verify the ticket's source.

With respect to claim 20, Bari in view of Rosen teaches the system for an affiliated web site applied to claim 19. In order to verify the ticket's source, as discussed in the rejection of claim 19, it would have been necessary to modify the ticket authentication mechanism to comprise a signature authentication mechanism for authenticating the digital signature of the ticket using a verifying key. The examiner takes Official Notice that encrypting information prior to transferring information was very well known in the art at the time of invention. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to encrypt the contents of the ticket so that the contents of the ticket would be hard for a hacker to decipher. Given the encrypted ticket it would have been necessary for the system to comprise a ticket decoding mechanism for, after the ticket is authenticated, decoding the ticket so that the affiliated web site is able to decipher the contents of the ticket. It would have been necessary that the system comprise

a ticket parsing mechanism for, after the ticket is decoded, parsing the ticket to extract the information related to the user so that the system could register the user as discussed in the rejection of claim 19.

With respect to claim 21, Bari in view of Rosen teaches the system for an affiliated web site applied to claim 20. Bari further discloses the system wherein the registration mechanism comprises:

- a user status determiner for determining whether the user is a new user or an existing user (inherent in ¶ 51 lines 3-5);
- a new user registration mechanism for, if the user is a new user, registering the user as a new user based on the information related to the user extracted from the ticket (inherent in ¶ 51 lines 13-19); and
- an existing user registration mechanism for registering an existing user, including authenticating the existing user, registering the existing user, and updating the information related to the existing user stored in the user information database, if the extracted information related to the user is different from the information related to the user information database (¶ 52 lines 1-9, it would have been necessary for the system to authenticate the existing user to perform this function).

With respect to claim 29, Bari in view of Rosen teaches the method for an affiliated web site applied to claim 28. Bari further discloses registering the user comprising:

- determining, using the user's identification, whether the user is a new user, with respect to the information stored in a user's information database at the affiliated web site (inherent in ¶ 51 lines 3-5);

Art Unit: 2153

- determining whether a new account should be opened for the user if the user is identified as a new user (inherent in ¶ 51 lines 3-5);
- opening a new account for the user if it is determined that a new account should be opened for a new user (¶ 51 lines 18-19);
- authenticating, if the user is not a new user, using the information related to the user stored in the user information database (¶ 46 lines 8-14);
- determining, if the user is authenticated by the authenticating, whether the information related to the user decoded from the ticket is different from the information related to the user stored in the user's information database at the affiliated web site (inherent in ¶ 52 lines 1-9); and
- updating the user's information database based on the information related to the user decoded from the ticket, if either the user is a new user or the information in the user information database at the affiliated web site is different from the information related to the user decoded from the ticket (¶ 52 lines 1-9).

Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bari in view of Rosen, and further in view of Debian.

With respect to claim 11, Bari in view of Rosen teaches the method for an affiliated web site applied to claim 10. Bari does not expressly disclose the user's preferences including the user's language preference. Nonetheless, storing a user's information comprising the user's language preference is well known, as evidenced by Debian. In a similar art, Debian discloses storing a user's language preference (p. 1 "To set the default language in your browser you have to set a variable that gets passed to the

Art Unit: 2153

web server.”). Given the teachings of Debian it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adapt the user’s preferences to include the user’s language preference. The motivation for doing so would have been so that in the case that the registration requires a default language setting the method is able to provide the default language setting.

With respect to claim 12, Bari in view of Rosen, and further in view of Debian teaches the method for an affiliated web site applied to claim 11. Bari further discloses registering the user comprising:

- determining, using the user’s identification, whether the user is a new user, with respect to the information stored in a user’s information database at the affiliated web site (inherent in ¶ 51 lines 3-5);
- determining whether a new account should be opened for the user if the user is identified as a new user (inherent in ¶ 51 lines 3-5);
- opening a new account for the user if it is determined that a new account should be opened for a new user (¶ 51 lines 18-19);
- authenticating, if the user is not a new user, using the information related to the user stored in the user information database (¶ 46 lines 8-14);
- determining, if the user is authenticated by the authenticating, whether the information related to the user decoded from the ticket is different from the information related to the user stored in the user’s information database at the affiliated web site (inherent in ¶ 52 lines 1-9); and
- updating the user’s information database based on the information related to the user decoded from the ticket, if either the user is a new user or the information in the

user information database at the affiliated web site is different from the information related to the user decoded from the ticket (¶ 52 lines 1-9).

Conclusion

The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- Toomey et al. (WO 2004/006499)
- Lu et al. (US 2002/0186249)
- Mitchell et al. (US 2002/0120867)
- Hunt et al. (US 6,496,855)
- Kumhyr, David Bruce (US 2003/0005159)
- Edwards et al. (US 2003/0023880)
- Merriman et al. (US 2002/0082923)
- Baudu et al. (US 2002/0052948)
- Anupam et al. (US 6,070,185)
- Martin et al. (US 6,035,334)
- *The Moron's Guide to Kerberos*,
"<http://www.isi.edu/gost/brian/security/kerberos.html>", 12/19/1996
- *Kerberos FAQ, v2.0*, "<http://www.faqs.org/faqs/kerberos-faq/general/index.html>",
8/18/2000
- *phpBB Features*,
"<http://web.archive.org/web/20010801142554/phpbb.com/features.php>", 8/11/2001

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip S. Scuderi whose telephone number is (571) 272-5865. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton B. Burgess can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PSS



ZARNI MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER